

**FRANKLIN HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION
MINUTES
July 14, 2014**

The Franklin Historic Zoning Commission held its regular scheduled meeting on Monday, July 14th, 2014, at 5:00 pm in the City Hall Boardroom at 109 Third Avenue South.

Members Present: Chairwoman Susan Besser
 Mary Pearce
 Rusty Womack
 Mike Hathaway
 Trisha Nesbitt
 Kate Reynolds (arrived at 5:16 and left at 6:41 pm)
 Jim Roberts
 Mel Thompson

Staff Present: Amanda Hall, Planning & Sustainability Department
 Meghan Scholl, Planning & Sustainability Department
 Kristen Corn, Law Department (via teleconference)
 Steve Haynes, Building and Neighborhood Services Department
 Vernon Gerth, ACA Community & Economic Development
 Catherine Powers, Planning & Sustainability Department

1. Minutes: June 9, 2014

Mr. Hathaway moved to approve the minutes.

Chairwoman Besser stated that on page 11, where it noted she had said “logical and less obtrusive to have another type of covering on the patio,” that she meant it as an option.

Mr. Hathaway amended his motion to include the comment to add the word “option” within Chairwoman Besser’s statement.

Mr. Roberts seconded the motion; the motion carried unanimously (7-0).

2. Citizens Comments on Items Not on the Agenda

Chairwoman Besser asked if there were any items not on the agenda that someone would like to speak about. There was no answer.

3. Consideration of Partial Demolition (Accessory) at 901 Fair St.; Tally Osburn & Marty Osburn; Applicants.

Ms. Hall stated that the applicants are requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the partial demolition of an accessory structure. Ms. Hall explained that the ca. 1905 carriage house structure is largely located on the property located at 902 W. Main St., but a roof structure was constructed outward from the accessory structure during the 1980s to cover a brick patio at 901 Fair St. Ms. Hall stated that the applicants are proposing the removal due to structural concerns and that the applicants state that new roof trim and gutter would be added to the carriage house where the extending roof structure would be removed. Ms. Hall noted that the applicants have submitted an owner affidavit from the 902 W. Main St. property owner.

Ms. Hall continued stating that staff recommends approval with conditions of the demolition of the roof structure of the accessory structure that extends over 901 Fair Street, as it possesses no historical or architectural integrity, with the following conditions:

1. As a condition of approval, the roof eaves/detailing and gutters for the remaining accessory structure must return to the Preservation Planner for review and approval prior to issuance of a demolition permit.
2. The application must meet all of the requirements of the Building and Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a demolition permit.

Chairwoman Besser asked the applicant to please state their name and offer any comment on the application.

Mr. Marty Ozburn stated his name as the applicant and stated that the roof structure was added in 1980 to the historic carriage house and that the height of the roof is 7 feet, which is below the required height codes of today's roofing structures. Mr. Ozburn stated that the structure hold heat and takes away from the historic value of the carriage house itself.

Ms. Nesbitt asked what the new height will be.

Mr. Ozburn answered that the height would not change and stated that they would only be cleaning the area up so that the historic carriage house will look like the original.

Mr. Hathaway asked if this was just for demolition of the roof structure.

Mr. Ozburn answered yes.

Ms. Pearce moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #4614 for the demolition of the roof structure that extends over the 901 Fair St. property only, with the overall historic accessory structure to remain, with staff's comments, in accordance with the Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated July 14, 2014.

Mr. Hathaway seconded the motion; the motion carried unanimously (7-0).

4. Consideration of Demolition (Accessory) at 216 & 220 Bridge St.; Jason Allen & Nick Shelton, Applicants.

Chairwoman Besser stated that she was recusing herself from this item and that Ms. Pearce would be taking over the item as Vice Chair.

Ms. Hall stated that the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the demolition of a garage accessory structure that is situated on the side property line between 216 & 220 Bridge Street. Ms. Hall noted that the applicant has not yet submitted a formal site plan application to the City of Franklin for the parking proposal demonstrated within the packet COA application materials but that Planning staff, however, has indicated in a preliminary conversation with the applicants some concerns about potential adverse impacts to trees on site if parking is proposed to circumvent the existing garage structure as currently location.

Ms. Hall continued that the project may not be consistent with the *Guidelines*. Ms. Hall explained that the subject structure, noting that it is a single-story garage with a shingle-clad front-facing gable and an asymmetrical façade that features one wood, simple carriage-style garage door and one older-looking

wood entry door. Ms. Hall stated that the structure is clad in what appears to be aluminum siding and has a metal roof, that there is a small window on the rear elevation and a flat carport that extends from the left elevation (the flat carport/awning extension was previously approved for demolition by the Historic Zoning Commission at its May 12, 2014 meeting), and that it is set on a block foundation. Ms. Hall stated that Williamson Co. Property Assessor data lists the subject structure as a detached garage of 360 sq. ft. with a flat carport of 220 sq. ft. Ms. Hall stated that while the exact date of construction for the garage accessory structure is unknown, Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps from Sept. 1928/Apr. 1940 depict a building footprint near the location of the existing garage accessory structure (see Exhibit 2) and that it appears the Sanborn map footprint may represent that of the existing structure, sans modern carport addition. Ms. Hall stated that if so, the structure dates to a construction period between the 1920s and 1940 and that the *Guidelines* recommend the preservation and maintenance of historic outbuildings (p.70). Ms. Hall explained that no additional information has been provided by the applicants to substantiate historical or architectural integrity, structural integrity, or economic hardship, all of which are criteria by which demolition may be considered (p.50).

Ms. Hall stated that staff recommends deferral of the demolition of the garage accessory structure for the following reasons:

1. Staff respectfully requests that the applicant submit additional information to substantiate the criteria by which the Historic Zoning Commission may review demolition requests.
2. If the building location conflicts with parking siting issues, staff recommends that the applicants consider relocation of the structure elsewhere on one of the properties (216 & 200 Bridge Street) as an alternative to demolition. The *Guidelines* recommend against relocation of outbuildings from their original locations unless it is the only way to preserve them (p.70). The relocation must be approved for issued of a COA and meet all the requirements of the City of Franklin.

Ms. Pearce asked the applicant to state their name.

Mr. Jason Allen stated his name as the applicant and continued with comment on the application. Mr. Allen stated that he and Mr. Shelton (the other applicant) had met with Larry Mizell, Landscape Planner for the City of Franklin, whom advised them that the only way to have a parking lot behind addresses 216 and 220 Bridge Street is to either take out the garage or take out trees. Mr. Shelton stated that although they are not asking to relocate the structure, it would be an option for them as well, as they are hoping to not lose the trees.

Mr. Nick Shelton explained that when this garage was built, cars were not commercially sold and that he was unsure of how old the structure would have to be to be considered historic.

Ms. Pearce stated that it is a 50-year rule to be considered historic, which shows change over time. Ms. Pearce stated that for clarification, the criteria that every outbuilding to be valuable would have to be in the period of the original house is not in the *Guidelines*. Ms. Pearce explained she had an outbuilding similar to this structure with a wash house.

Mr. Shelton stated that when they met with Mr. Mizell, he said the drip line of the trees was the issue.

Ms. Powers stated that there are other options rather than taking out the trees and replacing them with certain calipers additionally, if that is what is to be decided. Ms. Powers stated that that may not make the Planning Department happy, but they would want to decide what would be more important.

Mr. Thompson asked about how these structures were built, specifically whether there was permanent foundation or if it was built on concrete slab.

Mr. Allen stated that Ms. Hall has pictures to show. Mr. Allen stated that on the original Sanborn map, it shows there is gravel on the left side and that on the right side, there are wood planks on a wood panel foundation. Mr. Allen stated that in the Sanborn study, only half of the structure is represented and that all of the structure on the Sanborn is on 216 Bridge. Mr. Allen stated the entire structure today overlaps onto 220 Bridge Street.

Ms. Pearce asked if the sink was long gone, with the ringer.

Mr. Allen said yes, it would be; Mr. Allen then explained that the tin roof and studs are exposed and that it appears to be 30-40 years old on the left side.

Ms. Pearce asked for the site plan to be put on the projection screen.

Mr. Shelton then added that the garage is within the flood zone.

Mr. Hathaway asked if the garage sat on the property line or if the structure expands to one property to the other.

Discussion ensued about the condition and current location of the structure, which was explained to be located on both properties, sitting on the property line, and has only gravel underneath the structure, with no wooden planks or concrete.

Ms. Pearce asked that if they were to work around the garage if they would be in the drip line of the trees.

Mr. Allen answered yes and stated the circumference of each of the trees: 36 inch Maple tree, 30 inch Oak Tree, and a 20-30 inch Hackberry.

Mr. Hathaway stated that it is important to save the trees, as they are a heritage to the city.

Mr. Allen and Mr. Shelton stated that they do not have a preference either way to save the trees or the garage but that they just need to know what to do.

Mr. Thompson asked how the garage was built and whether one day in the future there would be issues with the structure that may result in having to tear it down anyways.

Ms. Pearce stated that the trees win this debate unless the owners would relocate the structure.

Mr. Allen stated that if at all possible, they would relocate the structure somewhere else on the property and that this result would help deal with the flood plain and parking.

Ms. Pearce stated that the other issue for deferral is the reason in the application for removing the structure because of age is not a valid reason. Ms. Pearce asked Ms. Kristen Corn whether it is acceptable for the commission to give valid reasons or if it needs to be given a valid reason for deferral.

Mr. Shelton stated that they could amend the project application to state the reason more specifically.

Ms. Powers stated that the reason needs to be compelling because although the City will make an argument for this case, this could set a precedence for demolition in future cases. Ms. Powers stated that she would feel better deferring this proposal for a more solid case in terms of deferral. Demolition set certain precedents for applications in the future. Ms. Powers stated that deferral makes more sense since there isn't an efficient amount of evidence for demolition right now.

Mr. Hathaway stated that it is understandable to know where the structure could be relocated to and that if this meeting gives any permission for demolition, that gives the applicant the chance to demolish the structure, even if they would like to relocate it. Mr. Hathaway stated they would defer it to get more information.

Mr. Shelton explained that they do not want to wait another thirty days before it gets done, for financial reasons, if at all possible, as they were not anticipating this when they had sat in the pre-pre application meeting with Mr. Mizell.

Ms. Powers stated that she understood where they were coming from, however, these *Guidelines* are very different, with a different commission, and they must have separate approvals to move forward. Ms. Powers stated that demolition is not to be taken lightly.

Mr. Thompson asked Ms. Hall that if it seemed like they stated the clear reasons to approve whatever they choose to approve, then looking into the future, somebody says HZC approved demolition without reason, if we state those reasons now we've clarified the precedence for why we made this decision. Mr. Thompson continued, stating that without any clarification in the minutes saying "these are the reasons," he states that he thinks it gives consistency for the future and that it does not open a can of worms for everyone.

Ms. Hall answered Mr. Thompson that if the commission gives the reason for approving a project, and as long as the reasons are applicable to the project and issues this project in length, and refer to our *Guidelines* or our Zoning Ordinance for demolition, which would be appropriate.

Mr. Allen stated that he did not see how this project would gain anything in 30 days, and he does not see the City of Franklin allowing them to ruin three trees to help a structure that has little to no historical value and needs maintenance now. Mr. Allen state that they are okay with keeping the building, but if they wait another 30 days, Mr. Allen stated that they will just be right back at where they are now and that they don't see a reason to wait, if at all.

Mr. Shelton mentioned a portion of the application that they stated that the City of Franklin requested that they remove the garage instead of going around the garage, into the drip line of the trees for parking in the back. Mr. Shelton stated that that's all that this is about, as those drip line of the trees are not going to change, even 60 years from now. Mr. Shelton stated there will always be that issue and that Mr. Mizell was fine with the original site plan going around the trees but that Mr. Mizell noticed that they would be entering the drip line of the trees. Mr. Shelton stated that they offered to do permeable parking, but he said no and that they need to go to HZC to get the garage taken down.

Ms. Pearce stated she knew where he was coming from with what he was saying. Ms. Pearce stated that the structure does have historic significance, as it is one of a handful of structure similar in town, and they're precious little buildings and they're usable with a sink in them. Ms. Pearce stated that with that said, she is comfortable restating the reasoning that would allow for demolition as that in this particular case, they would be choosing between the trees and the building. Ms. Pearce stated that even the trees will die sometime soon, but right now they might get another 50-100 years of life. Ms. Pearce stated that would be my only reason, and it would still be helpful if the structure could and would be moved.

Ms. Pearce then asked if anyone had a motion, to be deferred or approved, or whatever they decide.

Mr. Hathaway stated that he understood the owners' perspective and what they are trying to accomplish, and Mr. Hathaway stated that he is thinking about the precedent in this case. Mr. Hathaway stated that worst case scenario, there are so many trees in downtown Franklin that that could become a common "drip line, take the building down" sort of thing. Mr. Hathaway stated he was not dismissing the importance of what

the applicants are trying to do, but that the thought of long-term effects causes him to raise concerns and questions. Mr. Hathaway stated would like to hear the insight of the City Attorney, but that is his only concern.

Ms. Nesbit stated that staff recommended deferral, as well as Ms. Powers, and that is the motion she would like to make.

Ms. Pearce asked if she was suggesting a motion.

Ms. Nesbit said yes.

Ms. Hall asked that a deferral be clarified to a specific date and time.

Ms. Pearce asked Ms. Nesbit if she wanted to defer to the August Historic Zoning Meeting.

Ms. Nesbit said yes.

Mr. Allen asked that with this process, if they could get a firm no, so that he could proceed in that direction on not removing the structure.

Mr. Shelton stated that they were not excited for removing it but that if they got a no today, they could go to Mr. Mizell to approve going around. Mr. Shelton stated that they know right now that they will have to go around and do another application. Mr. Shelton stated that they don't want to remove the trees, and they may not be able to and that deferral would be the worst thing for them.

Ms. Reynolds stated that she would like to see the structure relocated on the site rather than it be taken down. Ms. Reynolds stated that the trees shouldn't be taken down, nor should the structure, and that she would hate to make a decision because it has to be made and have it not be the right decision.

Mr. Hathaway stated that he would like to make a separate motion to approve the relocation of the existing garage based on the applicant providing a site plan on a later date for approval to this commission that will give direction that is acceptable in establishing the structure relocation on site in a manner that is appropriate, rather than demolition.

Mr. Womack seconded the motion; the motion carried unanimously (8-0).

Chairwoman Besser entered the room at 5:35 pm.

5. Consideration of Demolition (Accessory) at 243 3rd Ave. S.; Jennifer Dowling Mackenzie, Applicant.

Ms. Hall stated that the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition of a garage accessory structure at 243 3rd Avenue South and that the applicant will be seeking approval for construction of a new accessory structure at a later date. Ms. Hall stated that this project proposal is consistent with the *Guidelines*. Ms. Hall explained that the subject structure is a simple single-story garage with a front-facing gable, two opening bays with no doors, and a shingle roof and that it is clad in lap wood siding. Ms. Hall noted that as viewed from the front (S. Margin St. view), the structure leans to the right. Ms. Hall also noted that the elevations are devoid of fenestration. Ms. Hall stated that Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps from September 1928/April 1940 do not depict a corresponding building footprint at the location of the existing shed accessory structure (see Exhibits 1 and 2), and as such, it would appear that the subject accessory structure was not constructed by September 1928 at this location, nor was it

constructed by April 1940 at this location, when the 1928 Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps were revised. Ms. Hall stated that the structure does not appear to be designed in keeping with its principal structure.

Ms. Hall continued that the applicant has submitted an assessment report from Kevin Garman, PhD, PE, PG of Garman Engineering Company LLC that addresses the structural integrity of the accessory structure. Ms. Hall stated that according to this assessment, “the structure is in imminent danger of collapse” and “because the structure does not have a permanent foundation, it is not feasible to repair the structure.”

Ms. Hall stated that staff recommends approval for the demolition of the accessory structure, as it appears to possess no historical or architectural integrity and is documented as unsound by a registered professional engineer. Ms. Hall stated that a condition of approval is that the application must meet all of the requirements of the Building and Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a demolition permit.

Chairwoman Besser asked if there were any public citizens that would like to make comment on this item; there was no response. Chairwoman Besser asked the applicant to please state their name and comment if they wish.

Ms. Mackenzie stated that the structure has no foundation and sits on dirt and that bugs have gotten to the wood of the structure, some parts are falling, and you cannot put a car in the structure.

Mr. Roberts moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #4615 for the demolition of the accessory structure with staff’s comments, in accordance with the Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated July 14, 2014.

Mr. Thompson seconded the motion.

Mr. Hathaway asked if there was full documentation of this structure.

Ms. Hall stated that the documentation is all photographs, but if the commission seeks more, that would be okay.

Mr. Roberts mentioned that there was also the engineer’s report in the recommendation.

The motion carried unanimously (8-0).

6. Consideration of Alterations at 220 5th Ave. S.; Perry Wilson, Applicant.

Ms. Hall stated that the application is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for a series of alterations as follows:

- The first proposed alteration involves the removal of a band of contemporary windows, the relocation of three original windows, and the placement of a solid wood door along the rear elevation of an existing addition.
- The applicant is also requesting the placement of operable, wood shutters to the windows.
- The next proposed alteration requests the removal of French style doors from the face of the attached garage-like addition and their replacement with three wood windows of true divided-light or simulated divided-light. The applicant is proposing to infill the rest of the area with wood exterior that will exactly match the existing wood.

- The fourth proposed alteration is a request to replace the concrete material on the front porch with tongue-and-groove wood and to replace the metal handrail with a wooden handrail.
- Lastly, the applicant is proposing the removal of the existing front porch lights and their replacement with simple lights described as “appropriate to the scale of the house and constructed of historically prevalent materials.”

Ms. Hall stated that staff recommends approval with conditions of the alterations with the following:

1. As conditions of approval:
 - Any siding used to in-fill areas on the facades where windows are removed or relocated on the rear elevation must be consistent with the material, profile, and design of the existing siding configuration for consistency with the *Guidelines*.
 - Any new windows must be wood in material and of a historically appropriate profile and dimension for consistency with the *Guidelines*. Window specifications must be submitted to the Preservation Planner for review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit.
 - Shutters must be wood, appear operable, and fit within their openings.
2. Staff recommends consideration (not a condition of approval) of the implementation of an in-fill siding treatment on the garage façade that would differentiate from the existing siding or otherwise “ghost” the previous existence of a garage entrance so as to maintain the look of the addition’s original function.
3. Staff recommends the Historic Zoning Commission direct the applicant direct the applicant to submit material for staff review that meets the *Guidelines* related to the proposed porch handrail replacement and lighting fixtures prior to issuance of a COA.
4. The application must meet all of the requirements of the Building and Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a demolition permit.

Chairwoman asked the applicant to please state their name and comment if they wish.

Mr. Perry Wilson stated his name as the applicant and added that he used to do historic preservation work. Mr. Wilson stated the concrete porch does not look to be of the period of the original home and the metal hand rail was not as well; he would like to get anything that would match the original. Mr. Wilson stated that if the commission, or if anyone, has photographs that could help that he does not have, he would like to see them for comparison to match as closely as possible, or whatever the commission would suggest. Mr. Wilson stated he would like to replace the Home Depot light fixtures with something of the time period as well and that what was the garage will be a master bath with French doors that he would really like to change out. Mr. Wilson stated that he is also open for anything historically that he could use to go back to the period and added that he appreciates what the commission does, and he wants to get any feedback on what to do for this house to make it more historical. Mr. Wilson stated there are other things like the shutters and paint that he would like to look more historical as well.

Chairwoman Besser stated that Ms. Hall had mentioned that the area where the French doors are, which the applicant had proposed windows. Chairwoman Besser stated that the fact that Mr. Wilson has taken this up with a more appropriate window is great, but where the French doors are, maybe there could be an appearance of a window or partial window.

Mr. Wilson explained that if he cannot match to the original, he would go contemporary to make people think it was part of the house. Mr. Wilson mentioned that he does not want fake garage doors.

Mr. Womack stated that the doors are lovely and he recalls that the HZC approved them before, so maybe he could treat the inside of that room with insulation but leave the doors to look the way they do outside. Discussion ensued about the look and use of the garage doors.

Mr. Womack then asked if the tub was on the wall where the doors are currently.

Mr. Wilson answered yes.

Mr. Thompson then suggested taking the windows out.

Mr. Wilson stated that he wanted to keep the windows.

Ms. Hall added that staff's recommendation, though not a condition of approval, for the structure was to be to maintain the resemblance of an entrance. Ms. Hall stated that it appears as a garage, and it could be appropriate to keep that look even if it does not keep that use.

Ms. Pearce asked if Ms. Hall was comfortable with the applicant going back to her with the design for approval by staff.

Chairwoman Besser asked if there were any more comment on this project.

Ms. Reynolds added to make sure the windows were to be appropriate when relocating the windows.

Ms. Pearce made the motion that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #4612 for the alterations with staff comments and that the applicant be given some leeway on how the door is handled but drawings brought back to staff for approval and that it all be done in accordance with the Franklin Historic District Design *Guidelines* based on the staff report and recommendation stated on July 14th, 2014.

Mr. Womack asked Ms. Pearce to make it clear that she was talking about the garage door.

Ms. Pearce confirmed that she was stating the motion based upon the garage door and windows. Ms. Pearce stated there is some leeway on the applicant and that everything with drawings must come back to staff for approval. Ms. Pearce stated there is possibility that the windows and doors may not come back with the ultimate solution.

Mr. Wilson stated that he understood and asked if that meant it was approved.

Mr. Roberts seconded the motion that Ms. Pearce had moved; the vote was then carried unanimously (8-0).

7. Consideration of Additions (Porch, Breezeway), Alterations (Principal), & Alterations (Accessory) at 106 Winslow Rd.; Richard & Laura House, Applicants.

Ms. Hall stated that the applicants are requesting a certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of rear porch onto the residence at 106 Winslow Road. Ms. Hall stated that the applicants are requesting to construct a covered breezeway to connect the existing house and garage and that additional proposed alterations include the placement of two dormers onto the 1975 addition on the principal structure and the removal of the garage doors and their replacement with full-glass entry doors. Ms. Hall noted that the applicants appeared before the Design Review Committee to discuss the proposal at its June 16, 2014, meeting.

Ms. Hall continued that staff recommends approval with conditions of the proposed porch and breezeway additions, the left elevation dormer, and the garage door alterations with the following:

- As a condition of approval, all windows must be wood in material and of a historically appropriate profile and dimension for consistency with the *Guidelines*. Window specifications

must be submitted to the Preservation Planner for review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit.

- As a condition of approval, garage door specifications must be submitted to the Preservation Planner for review and approval in light of the *Guidelines* prior to issuance of a building permit.
- The application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a building permit. Any additional changes and/or proposed changes to the HZC-approved plans must be returned to the HZC for review and approval.

Ms. Hall then stated that staff recommends denial of the proposed right elevation dormer with the following:

- The proposed dormer on the right elevation is not consistent with the *Guidelines*, as the *Guidelines* recommend against the placement of dormers on front or highly visible elevations (p.78, #4). The right elevation dormer, due to its proposed placement, appears to be visible from the street/public right-of-way based on photographs and drawings presented.
- If issued a COA, the dormer window must be wood in material and of a historically appropriate profile and dimension for consistency with the *Guidelines*. Window specifications must be submitted to the Preservation Planner for review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit.
- If issued a COA, the application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a building permit. Any additional changes and/or proposed changes to the HZC-approved plans must be returned to the HZC for review and approval. A scaled set of elevations with a roof plan that notates the location of each approved dormer must be submitted to the Preservation Planner prior to issuance of a building permit.

Ms. Hall added that any proposed fencing is subject to review for issuance of a COA. Ms. Hall noted that fencing may qualify for administrative review and that the applicant may submit material for staff review consideration as part of the Administrative Review COA application process.

Chairwoman Besser asked the applicant to please state his name and continue with any comment they may have regarding the project proposed.

Mr. Preston Quirk introduced himself as the applicant's architect and continued with comment. Mr. Quirk stated there is no objection to item 1, however Design Review Committee asked the applicant to please change the roof, which they had. Mr. Quirk stated the dormer was put on at a later date around the 1980's. Mr. Quirk stated that they understand the visibility factor and that the dormer might be more appropriate on the left side instead. Mr. Quirk stated the second floor attic is not usable space, since the roof is so steep, so they would like to incorporate more into the master. Mr. Quirk stated the left dormer is screened by the house, so they would like to extend it further instead of adding another dormer. Mr. Quirk state the fence is a simple rod iron. Mr. Quirk noted that at DRC, they discussed the glass doors on the garage, and they had shown it as two four-foot doors, but Mr. Quirk stated that he was not sure if it would be acceptable to have 3 32-inch doors and that he would like to make them look like a pair of doors or they would be okay with three panels, instead of two.

Chairwoman Besser asked if there were any public citizens that would like to comment on this item. There was no response; Ms. Besser then asked if there were any Commissioners who would like to comment or ask any questions on the item.

Mr. Roberts stated he did not understand staff's objection to the dormer on the right and he asked Ms. Hall to clarify.

Ms. Hall stated that the dormer would appear to be visible from the street and that there is a tree that masks some of the dormer, but landscape is not looked at as a means of mitigation when it comes to preservation.

Ms. Hall stated that the left dormer will be completely shielded by the existing roofline of building and will not be visible from the public right-of-way.

Mr. Hathaway stated that there are occasions where a dormer added would be where a dormer would have been, so it is possible someone could look at it and say, "That makes sense, and it probably would have been there at the beginning if it wanted it or needed it."

Ms. Pearce stated that this is a good solution here.

Mr. Hathaway agreed, and stated that extending the left dormer helps the style of the house with a connected dormer. Mr. Hathaway stated he would like to propose a suggestion of some trim to let the windows have a place and not sort of floating. Mr. Hathaway stated that he would be acceptable to the alternative of extending the left dormer, rather than having a right dormer. Mr. Hathaway stated that as far as the windows of the garage, he was not sure of the four foot door makes sense but that he likes the idea of the three-panel door. Mr. Hathaway stated that two four-foot doors would be out of character.

Mr. Quirk stated that they could do that.

A sketch of an extended left dormer was circulated around to the commissioners.

Ms. Nesbitt asked Ms. Hall if full glass was acceptable on a garage door.

Ms. Hall stated that it would be preferable for an entrance be maintained, or the appearance of an entrance of a garage be maintained. Ms. Hall stated that a solution could be removable, so that the opening could be eligible to be maintained in the future, so that it does not have to come back in the future to be reverted back. Ms. Hall explained that another scenario would be for the use of another garage door in a carriage-style so that ideally, maintaining the existing garage to appear as an entrance so that the garage looks to be of that use and not of another principal structure on the property.

Chairwoman Besser stated she would like to comment regarding the fence, stating that one thing they have had an ongoing issue within the commission are the types of fences used. Ms. Besser stated that the hollow core material is not typical of this time period, so the applicant may want to rethink that.

Ms. House stated that the fence was similar to other historic fences in Franklin and that the fence would only be on the side portion of the house, not the front yard.

Ms. Hall mentioned that the fence was not on the agenda for this meeting.

Ms. Reynolds stated that she had pictured the clear glass, and that the public view will probably see blinds or curtains. Ms. Reynolds stated that it may be a good idea to put some kind of process or film that will allow the light in but from the street you cannot see all that is in the garage.

Mr. Thompson stated that he would like to see the four glass panels rather than the two doors that will stick out.

Mr. Quirk stated that they did not discuss this as much at the Design Review, only that as long as the openings were preserved for any future use. Mr. Quirk stated that he could do a three-quarters wood panel with glass above and that they are pretty flexible on what they could do with the look.

Discussion ensued about the look of the garage doors.

Mr. Womack moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #4617 for the porch and breezeway additions, the placement of the left elevation dormer extended, and the alterations to the accessory structure doors, which would be suggested by the board to be a wood-paneled door which would provide light, with staff's comments, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated July 14, 2014.

Ms. Nesbitt seconded this motion.

Ms. Pearce asked to amend this motion to allow pictures submitted by the applicant to be part of the application.

Mr. Womack stated that the accessory structure doors would be wood-paneled with glass for lighting, representative of the picture brought to them by Mr. Quirk.

Ms. Hall asked about the picture of the extended dormer and whether they wanted the applicant to provide a design to staff that shows it reflected as a drawing.

Mr. Womack asked if it was just widening the existing dormer.

Ms. Hall answered yes.

Mr. Womack stated that the final drawings need to go to staff.

Chairwoman Besser asked if there was a second to the amendment.

Mr. Roberts seconded the amendment. The vote carried unanimously (8-0).

Chairwoman Besser asked whether there was a second for the motion. The vote carried unanimously (8-0).

Ms. Hall stated she needed a vote for the right side dormer.

Mr. Womack moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission deny issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #4617 for the placement of the right elevation dormer with staff's comments, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated July 14, 2014.

Ms. Reynolds seconded the motion; the vote carried unanimously (8-0).

8. Consideration of New Construction (Principal, Accessory) at 135 Harlinsdale Ct.; Andy & Nicole Bailey, Applicants.

Ms. Hall stated that the applicants are requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the construction of a 2 ½ story single-family residence with attached garage and detached garage at 135 Harlinsdale Ct. (Lot 3 Harlinsdale Manor). Ms. Hall stated that the item appeared before the Design Review Committee at its June 16, 2014 meeting.

Ms. Hall continued that staff recommends deferral of the proposed new construction (principal and accessory structures) with the following:

1. Staff respectfully requests that the applicant provide site grading information so as to provide a better understanding of the relationship between the situation of the proposed construction on the subject property and the existing lots and/or revise the proposal to be lower in overall height for

better consistency with the Guidelines and resubmit the proposal to the Historic Zoning Commission for consideration.

2. Construction of circular driveways in primary yards is not recommended by the *Guidelines*. As such, the applicant should revise the proposed site plan to reflect a driveway arrangement that is consistent with the *Guidelines*.
3. If issued a COA, as a conditions of approval:
 - Any deviation from the overall height (39'-5"), foundation height, finished floor elevation, or siting of the structure as presented within this application, due to grading or otherwise, must be submitted to the Preservation Planner or the Planning Director for review and approval prior to construction.
 - All windows must be wood in material and of a historically appropriate profile and dimension for consistency with the *Guidelines*. Window specifications must be submitted to the Preservation Planner for review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit.
 - Garage door specifications must be submitted to the Preservation Planner for review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit.
 - Unless approved otherwise by the Historic Zoning Commission, the accessory structure design must be altered to include an 18" masonry base in accordance with the Franklin Zoning Ordinance. Revised elevations must return to the Preservation Planner for review and approval.
4. If issued a COA, the application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a building permit. Foundation height surveys may be required at the time of building permit review to ensure compatibility with the height and massing conditions set forth within the project's corresponding Certificate of Appropriateness. Any additional changes and/or proposed changes to the HZC-approved plans (including the siting of the structure or its driveway) must be returned to the HZC for review and approval.
5. If issued a COA, a scaled set of elevations notating the following must be submitted to the Preservation Planner prior to issuance of a building permit:
 - finished floor elevation;
 - overall building height;
 - revised site plan depicting accurate siting of structure in relation to driveway/curb cut configuration;
 - foundation height with proposed/conceptual grading from front property line to foundation of house, and proposed/conceptual grading along the front façade of the house (if such information cannot be provided, foundation height details should be given for the largest and smallest foundation heights envisioned for the site); and
 - all approved building materials, including porch steps.

Chairwoman Besser asked the applicant to please state their name.

Mr. Quirk stated his name as the applicant's architect and continued on about the proposed item. Mr. Quirk stated that this item went to DRC for a fairly brief meeting, mainly about the height of the house. Mr. Quirk stated that he did research on the height of other homes and reviewed Ms. Hall's data for actual heights. Mr. Quirk stated that his height research as follows:

- Lot 10 is about 39 feet.
- Lot 12 is about 37 feet on the right side.
- Lot 3 is about 37.
- The proposed item is about 39 feet.

Mr. Quirk continued, stating that the house proposed is about 2 feet higher at the ridge and that the reason why there is more height here is because it is a more Victorian house style, which is more vertical. Mr. Quirk stated that most of the homes in the subdivision are more of a right-to-left ridge, front-to-back gable but that they want a variation in style so that not every house is the same. Mr. Quirk stated that the house is on a rise in the back of the subdivision and that there will be a retaining wall in the back and a pool area. Mr. Quirk stated that at DRC, they mentioned the height difference between this house and Sean's house, which is about 2 feet. Mr. Quirk also stated that they would be able to change the drive from the proposed circular drive. Mr. Quirk stated that staff is recommending deferral, but they would like to get approval on this. Mr. Quirk stated that the computer drawing of the house is an accurate model as he could get on the computer and that he worked very hard on it.

Chairwoman Besser asked if there were any public citizens whom would like to comment on this; there was no response.

Ms. Pearce stated she had not picked up on the circular steps, and she stated she believed they would not be appropriate. Ms. Pearce stated that this house is the house you would see most from Harlinsdale Park.

Mr. Quirk confirmed that you could see this property from Franklin Road.

Ms. Pearce stated that the rear of this house is fairly busy and that as a neighbor to a National Registered site, she would like to see more simplification. Ms. Pearce stated that they had approved another home that was put back there that they were concerned about the foundation. Ms. Pearce stated that the commission made one decision that impacted the character of the subdivision and not in the best way. Ms. Pearce stated that she would hate to put this project off but she knows how precious a view shed this will be.

Mr. Hathaway added that there are a couple houses in this subdivision that are a little flush and that the main box is well done. Mr. Hathaway stated that what he struggled with architecturally about this project is that the board-and-batten of the horizontal siding. Mr. Hathaway stated that it seems odd where it stops and that he cannot describe or explain it right now.

Ms. Pearce stated that the front steps need to be simplified for this style of house.

Mr. Thompson brought up the back elevation's third level deck, stating that the window may need to be simplified as well.

Ms. Pearce asked if there was any foundation shown on the back.

Mr. Quirk answered that there would be some foundation shown on the back elevation.

Mr. Womack explained to Ms. Pearce that the computer's 3D program may be making the home exterior look busier than it actually will be.

Discussion ensued about simplifying the height and exterior of the home, including the front steps and driveway.

Ms. Nesbitt made the motion for the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission to defer this item to the July 21st Design Review meeting.

Ms. Reynolds seconded the motion.

Mr. Roberts asked if they needed a reason for deferral.

Ms. Pearce stated that another issue of hers was the business of the rear elevation and that it would be exposed to a National Registered Farm. Ms. Pearce suggested showing a rendering of this home and the house next to it in comparison. Ms. Pearce stated that this home will read as vertical, and there could be some things done that would lessen that. Ms. Pearce noted that examples of this would be that on the main façade, the windows and porch could be pushed up some. Ms. Pearce noted that this is not an amendment.

The vote for deferral to the July 21st DRC meeting carried unanimously (8-0).

Ms. Reynolds left the meeting at 6:41pm, after the vote was carried.

9. Consideration of Demolition (Accessory), New Construction (Accessory), and Alterations (Principal) at 117 Lewisburg Ave.; Joe Melz, Applicant.

Ms. Hall stated that the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the demolition of a shed accessory structure and carport and the construction of a 1.5-story carriage house accessory structure at 117 Lewisburg Ave. and that additionally, the applicant is requesting approval for alterations to the principal structure, including the removal of shingle siding from the dormers and its replacement with Hardie plank boards and the enclosure of a rear porch. Ms. Halls stated that the applicant is also requesting to replace a window that has been previously removed and boarded up within a rear elevation dormer. Ms. Hall noted that the applicant appeared before the Design Review Committee to discuss the proposal at its June 16, 2014 meeting.

Ms. Hall stated that staff recommends approval with conditions of the proposed alterations to the principal structure with the following:

1. Staff recommends the Historic Zoning Commission direct the applicant to submit elevations for staff review that meets the *Guidelines* related to the proposed porch enclosure prior to issuance of a COA.
2. The application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a building permit. Any additional changes and/or proposed changes to the HZC-approved plans must be returned to the HZC for review and approval.

Ms. Hall continued that staff recommends deferral of the proposed accessory structure demolitions (shed, carport) with the following:

1. Staff respectfully requests that the applicant submit additional information to substantiate the criteria by which the Historic Zoning Commission may review demolition requests. Demolition may only be approved if the HZC deems one or more of the following conditions met (p.50):
 - If a building has lost its architectural and historical integrity and its removal will not adversely affect the district's historic character (loss of integrity must be substantiated with photographic documentation and a physical description of the property that addresses relevant issues);
 - If the denial of the demolition will result in an unreasonable economic hardship on the applicant as determined by the Historic Zoning Commission (please refer to the Economic Hardship Evidentiary Checklist as provided. The HZC will use this checklist to assist with the review of economic hardship claims);
 - If the public safety and welfare requires the removal of a structure of building;
 - If the structural instability or deterioration of a property is demonstrated through a report by a structural engineer or architect. Such a report must clearly detail the property's physical condition, reasons why rehabilitation is not feasible, and cost estimates for

rehabilitation versus demolition. In addition to this report, there should be a separate report that details future action on the site.

2. If issued a COA, the application must meet all of the requirements of the Building and Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a demolition permit, and the buildings must be satisfactorily documented inside and out with photographs and submitted to staff for the Commission records.

Ms. Hall then stated that the staff recommends deferral for the proposed new construction of the accessory structure with the following:

1. Pursuant to the requirements of the Franklin Zoning Ordinance, residential lots shall be limited to a maximum of one accessory structure. Either relocation or demolition of the existing accessory structures must take place prior to consideration of new accessory structure construction.
2. If the proposed accessory structure new construction is issued a COA:
 - To meet the requirements of the Franklin Zoning Ordinance, the residential lot shall be limited to a maximum of one accessory building.
 - Unless approved otherwise by the Historic Zoning Commission, the accessory structure design must be altered to include an 18" masonry base in accordance with the Franklin Zoning Ordinance. Revised elevations must return to the Preservation Planner for review and approval.
 - Staff recommends the simplification of the window proposed on the front elevation of the carriage house for the better consistency with the *Guidelines* (p.61, #4).
 - Staff recommends that any deviation from the overall height (21'-0"), finished floor elevation or siting of the structure as presented within this application, due to grading or otherwise, must be submitted to the Preservation Planner or the Planning Director for review and approval prior to construction.
 - The application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a building permit. Foundation height surveys may be required at the time of building permit review to ensure compatibility with the height and massing conditions set forth within the project's corresponding Certificate of Appropriateness. Any additional changes and/or proposed changes to the HZC-approved plans must be returned to the HZC for review and approval.
 - A scaled set of elevations must be submitted to the Preservation Planner that notates the following items prior to issuance of a building permit:
 - all approved building materials of the accessory structure, including foundation material and lap reveal;
 - the overall height of the accessory structure in relation to its principal structure; and
 - the finished floor elevation of the accessory structure in relation to its principal structure.

Chairwoman Besser asked the applicant to please state their name.

Mr. Joe Melz stated his name as the applicant and continued with comment on this item: Mr. Melz stated that this item is not able to be viewed by the right of way from the public and unable to see by GIS because of the trees. Mr. Melz stated that the carport does not allow easy access to back in or out and that the carport stands on lattice and blocks the view of the house from the back yard. Mr. Melz stated that the proposed carriage house will be a great look and that the porch was somehow left out of the application, but he had information he would like to show as far as making it look the way the HZC had suggested it look. Mr. Melz stated that he would like to make everything look the way HZC would like it to look and he appreciated their help very much.

Chairwoman Besser asked if there were any public citizens whom would like to comment on this; there was no response.

Chairwoman Besser stated that she and some other commissioners went by the house and do see that it is a unique situation.

Ms. Pearce stated that the carport completely obliterates the back of the house. Ms. Pearce stated that the small shed seems to be historic but that they cannot have two accessory structures on a historic property; the historic structure it would have to be torn down.

Mr. Thompson stated that they could request a variance to have two accessory structures on their property because he had one and it did not take very long to have the variance granted.

Ms. Pearce stated that that would be an incredible solution. Ms. Pearce stated she agrees with having to justify tearing down historic structures, but there is in no way to say that this carport is historic in her mind.

Chairwoman Besser stated that the issue is there is no way to look at the carriage house because of the issue with the accessory structure, so that has to be dealt with somehow.

Mr. Melz stated that the lot is 270 feet deep and the back right-hand corner is really where the owner of the property would love to see it. Mr. Melz stated that he would like to propose taking the existing structure and moving it to the back right corner, which would allow to proceed with the carriage house.

Chairwoman Besser stated that the problem is that they cannot approve an accessory structure when there is already an accessory structure on the property.

Discussion ensued about the issue of the existing accessory structure and the carriage house, as well as proceeding to request a variance.

Ms. Powers added that there is no guarantee that there would be a variance granted.

Mr. Thompson explained his experience in requesting a variance to have two accessory structures on his property.

Ms. Pearce asked whether if commission could say that they would allow the historic structure to be moved on rails so that it could either come back attached to the carriage house if it did not get a variance or it could be moved in the best case.

Chairwoman Besser explained to the City Attorney Kristen Corn the situation and asked about the process of requesting a variance.

Ms. Corn stated that the request would go to the Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA). Ms. Corn stated that there is nothing legally wrong with requesting a variance to keep the shed.

Ms. Pearce moved that the applicant be permitted to move the historic accessory shed to the back right corner of the property if the variance is permitted by the Board of Zoning Appeals to allow two accessory structures on the property and that in the alternative that the applicant is denied, the applicant must come back with plans that put the structure in the back behind the carriage house, but in some way attached so that it reads as two buildings.

Mr. Melz stated that if they could get the project started, they could move it to where it looks best.

Ms. Pearce stated not to put it in a permanent location. Ms. Pearce stated that the structure should be pulled to the side on rails and let it sit until a plan.

Ms. Powers stated that once the applicant moves the structure, they lose their grandfathering.

Discussion ensued regarding the zoning and grandfathering of the structure.

Chairwoman Besser reminded the commission that there was a motion and asked if there was a second to the motion.

Mr. Thompson seconded the motion which Ms. Pearce stated.

Mr. Roberts asked whether they were running into any other issues with moving the structure now.

Mr. Womack stated that the applicant is doing this at his own risk.

Chairwoman Besser stated that it is problematic.

Mr. Thompson stated that he understands they are approving this based on him getting an approval for a variance. Mr. Thompson stated if the applicant does get approval, he can go ahead with the carriage house.

Chairwoman Besser agreed.

The vote carried unanimously (7-0).

Chairwoman Besser asked for a motion regarding demolition of the carport.

Mr. Womack reminded Chairwoman Besser that they need a motion for alterations.

Ms. Hall stated that if the commission wants to consider approval of the new construction, they must consider the carport item. Staff is recommending deferral based on the shed. However, the HZC has now taken care of the motion for the shed. The new construction was reviewed in light of the *Guidelines*, and it is appropriate otherwise.

Chairwoman Besser stated that they have talked about the accessory structure, now they have to talk about the alterations.

Mr. Hathaway moved that the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #4620 for the principal structure alterations with staff's comments, in accordance with the *Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines* and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated July 14, 2014.

Mr. Roberts seconded this motion.

Mr. Womack recommended an amendment that the lattice now be on the diagonal.

Ms. Pearce seconded this amendment.

The amendment passed unanimously (7-0).

The overall vote that Mr. Hathaway moved, including the amendment that Mr. Womack added, carried unanimously (7-0).

Discussion ensued between the commissioners regarding what motion they would make for the demolition of the carport.

Ms. Pearce moved to approve the demolition of the carport. Mr. Hathaway seconded the motion; the motion carried unanimously (7-0).

Ms. Hall continued on about the new construction for the carriage house:

- the accessory structure design must be altered to include an 18" masonry base in accordance with the Franklin Zoning Ordinance. Revised elevations must return to the Preservation Planner for review and approval.
- Staff recommends the simplification of the window proposed on the front elevation of the carriage house for the better consistency with the *Guidelines* (p.61, #4).
- Staff recommends that any deviation from the overall height (21'-0"), finished floor elevation or siting of the structure as presented within this application, due to grading or otherwise, must be submitted to the Preservation Planner or the Planning Director for review and approval prior to construction.

Mr. Melz stated that he was slightly confused about the recommendation for the windows, as this application went with a window recommended by the Design Review Committee.

Chairwoman Besser stated that the windows Ms. Hall is referring to are the carriage door windows, to simplify them.

Ms. Hall stated that she apologized since she was not at the recent DRC meeting that included this application. Ms. Hall clarified that the large window on the second story was what she was referring to, only because it faces the street view. Ms. Hall stated that otherwise she would not be recommending this.

Mr. Womack asked how this window would be simplified.

Ms. Hall explained that there is nothing on the house with that ornate of a grid pattern.

Mr. Hathaway stated that another option would be three fixed panels, with a mull between them. Mr. Hathaway stated that it would look like a big, long horizontal piece of glass, but it would look like the other windows.

Mr. Womack stated that he could see that.

Discussion ensued regarding the simplification and design of the window and what was discussed at DRC.

Ms. Pearce moved to approve the carriage house with the amendment that the middle window be divided into three sections and that the door to the garage be brought back to staff for approval and also that there be more carriage-type looking door with no black brackets on it, and with other staff comments that are compliant with our *Guidelines*.

Ms. Hall asked if she wanted to include the masonry base.

Ms. Pearce stated yes, since that is included in her staff recommendation.

Mr. Hathaway seconded this motion. The motion carried unanimously (7-0).

10. Consideration of Alterations at 708 W. Main St.; Matt Christensen, Applicant.

Ms. Hall stated that the applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the alteration of the residence at 708 W. Main St. through the construction of three dormers—one at the rear elevation, one at the left elevation, and one at the right elevation. Ms. Hall explained that additionally, the applicant is proposing to remove an existing window on the right elevation and replace it with three full-size windows, to replace the porch stoop area on the right elevation, and to reorient the door location/porch stoop and add new window openings on the rear elevation. Ms. Hall noted that the inclusion of two different floor plan “schemes” indicates a potential alteration to the front façade through the removal or enclosure of an entrance door, but given the lack of information or notation within the application materials to clarify this, staff is not considering this potential alteration proposal as part of this review. Ms. Hall stated that staff recommends approval with conditions of the proposed left elevation and rear elevation alterations with the following:

- As conditions of approval, the dormers must not exceed the height of the existing roof ridge line at the rear portion of the residence and the windows (in dormers or as new façade openings) must be wood in material and of a historically appropriate profile and dimension for consistency with the *Guidelines*. Window specifications must be submitted to the Preservation Planner for review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit.
- Staff recommends the Historic Zoning Commission direct the applicant to submit material for staff review that meets the *Guidelines* related to the proposed porch stoop replacements and the dormers’ roofing and siding material prior to issuance of a COA.
- The application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a building permit. Any additional changes and/or proposed changes to the HZC-approved plans must be returned to the HZC for review and approval. A scaled set of elevations must be submitted to the Preservation Planner that notates the following items prior to issuance of a building permit:
 - all approved building materials, notated on the architectural elevations; and
 - the overall height of each approved dormer in relation to the existing rooflines.

Ms. Hall continued stating that staff recommends denial of the proposed right elevation dormer and window placement with the following:

- The proposed dormer and window placement on the right elevation are not consistent with the *Guidelines*, as the *Guidelines* recommend against the placement of dormers on front or highly visible elevations (p.78, #4) and further recommend that dormers use designs, materials, and scale in keeping with building character (p.78, #6). The right elevation dormer, due to its proposed size and placement, would be visible from the street/public right-of-way. The proposed window additions on the right elevation are not consistent with the *Guidelines*, as the *Guidelines* recommend against the placement of new window openings to the primary or readily visible secondary elevations (p.86, #3). The proposed windows would be readily visible from the public right-of-way.
- If issued a COA, the dormer should not exceed the height of the existing roof ridge line at the rear portion of the residence.
- If issued a COA, the windows (in dormers or as new façade openings) must be wood in material and of a historically appropriate profile and dimension for consistency with the *Guidelines*. Window specifications must be submitted to the Preservation Planner for review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit.
- Staff recommends the Historic Zoning Commission direct the applicant to submit material for staff review that meets the *Guidelines* related to the proposed porch stoop replacements and, if approved, the dormer’s roofing and siding material prior to issuance of a COA.

- The application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a building permit. Any additional changes and/or proposed changes to the HZC-approved plans must be returned to the HZC for review and approval. A scaled set of elevations must be submitted to the Preservation Planner that notates the following items prior to issuance of a building permit:
 - all approved building materials, notated on the architectural elevations; and
 - the overall height of each approved dormer in relation to the existing rooflines.

Chairwoman asked the applicant to please state their name and add any comment they wish regarding the proposed item.

Mr. Randall Williams stated his name as the applicant and stated that Kevin Coffey will continue with comment on the item. Mr. Williams stated that his home has sentimental value to him and his wife. Mr. Williams noted that it was turned into a duplex in the 60s and that they would like to turn it back into a single family home. Mr. Williams stated that this home has had no significant renovation in several years, and they would like to take it back to its original footprint.

Ms. Pearce asked Ms. Hall which dormer she was objecting to in the staff recommendation.

Ms. Hall answered the right side dormer on the rear elevation. Ms. Hall stated that the *Guidelines* state not to add to physical elevations that are visible.

Ms. Pearce stated that she felt like this dormer is not an original component of the house. Ms. Pearce stated that it could have been built in or had been a side porch and that the small window looks similar to an approval they gave off of 5th Avenue North, where there was an odd addition also.

Mr. Williams agreed, stating that there have been several funky additions to the home.

Mr. Womack stated it looked like it had been mottled over the years and that this may be a great opportunity to de-muddle it.

Mr. Kevin Coffey introduced himself into the conversation.

Ms. Pearce stated she is sad every time a dormer goes up, but she stated she is not sure whether the dormer would take away from the character of the addition.

Mr. Coffey stated that the transom on the front side is from the 60s or 70s and that neither side of the duplex is functional. Mr. Coffey stated that you have to walk through a bedroom to get to the kitchen, and the other does not have a bedroom at all. Mr. Coffey stated that a little transition between and across to the bathroom and that there could have been windows there, where it housed a dining room. Mr. Coffey stated that when the bathroom went in, the owner may have changed it to a transom.

Ms. Pearce stated that these little houses may have had separate kitchen houses, and they brought them in with additions which allowed exterior siding inside the house. Ms. Pearce stated she felt more lenient on allowing modifications than she would normally see fit.

Mr. Coffey stated that this house is on a spot where there is no place to go. Mr. Coffey stated they are on the same footprint, there is no way to get a driveway or parking. Mr. Coffey explained that to just get it to where they are proposing, about 2,400 square feet, is a legitimate number, which would give it the ability to be livable.

Mr. Thompson made a motion to approve the Franklin Historic Zoning Commission approve with conditions a Certificate of Appropriateness for Project PL #4619 for the left elevation, rear elevation and right elevation alterations with staff's comments, in accordance with the Franklin Historic District Design Guidelines and based on the Staff Report & Recommendation dated July 14, 2014.

Mr. Roberts seconded this motion.

Mr. Womack asked if they were approving the dormer.

Chairwoman Besser stated yes, both motions were rolled into the motion stated by Mr. Thompson.

The motion carried unanimously (7-0).

11. Consideration of Partial Demolition, Alterations, & Addition at 107 Everbright Ave.; Bob & Adele Bass, Applicants.

Ms. Hall stated that the applicants are requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) for the partial demolition of an enclosed portion of the front façade so as to restore what the applicants believe to be the structure's original front porch configuration. Ms. Hall stated that additionally, the applicant is requesting to rework the rear and side elevations, including a covered rear porch area, so as to place an enclosed addition at the rear of the structure. Ms. Hall stated that the removal of existing window openings is proposed at the location of the rear addition.

Ms. Hall stated that staff recommends approval with conditions of the partial demolition and alteration of the front façade for the restoration of the original porch configuration with the following:

1. As a conditions of approval:
 - All windows must be wood in material and of a historically appropriate profile and dimension for consistency with the *Guidelines*. Window specifications must be submitted to the Preservation Planner for review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit. Staff recommends reuse of the removed window.
 - Existing porch columns should be repaired as needed and maintained unless extreme deterioration makes repair impossible (p.75, #11).
2. Staff recommends the Historic Zoning Commission direct the applicant to submit material for staff review that meets the *Guidelines* related to the proposed porch flooring material, column specifications/material, trim, and roofing material prior to issuance of a COA.
3. The application must meet all the requirements of the Building & Neighborhood Services Department prior to issuance of a building permit, and any additional changes and/or proposed changes to HZC-approved plans must be returned to the HZC for review and approval. A scaled set of elevations must be submitted to the Preservation Planner that notates all approved building materials of the front porch project, including columns, flooring, trim, and roofing prior to issuance of a building permit.

Ms. Hall continued stating that staff recommends denial of the reworking of the rear and sides elevations/placement of the rear elevation with the following:

1. The *Guidelines* recommend the placement of additions onto non-primary elevations, the *Guidelines* also recommend that additions be designed to be clearly contemporary and compatible with the proportions, form, materials, and details of the building (p.52, #2). It does not appear that the proposed elevation addition ties into the existing proportions of the building so as to allow those proportions to continue to read as distinctive forms on the building; the addition appears to envelop those forms. The design of the addition—as a two-story side gable—creates a scale and form that competes with the hipped forms of the original structure. Additionally, a

porch is proposed on the left side elevation of the proposed addition that would be highly visible from the street, which is not consistent with the *Guidelines* (p.75, #6).

Chairwoman Besser asked the applicant to please come forward and state their name.

Mr. Bob Bass introduced himself as the applicant and continued on with comment regarding this item. Mr. Bass stated that there are two main parts to this proposed item, the first is to bring the front porch back to the original state. Mr. Bass stated that he had normally done demolition for this purpose and you can see 100% of what it was. Mr. Bass stated that the concrete porch floor is still in existence and the windows that came out of the front of the house will be moved to the new exterior and they are still intact and he will replace and use them again. Mr. Bass stated that the socket of the porch is still intact and the stone is still intact, the columns are rotted, but it is their intention to replace these. Mr. Bass stated that no variations will be made when replacing items in this home and that they have looked around and found one other house with the same footprint: 4th Avenue Church of Christ daycare. Mr. Bass stated that they would like to not have to go back and do over the as-built drawing and that as far as the columns go, they are looking to get columns all the way around if possible. Mr. Bass explained that the roof is still intact and he believes that is what it had looked like when first built. Mr. Bass stated that on the back of the house, they are proposing a 70 foot depth structure, with 22 feet of that depth being the gable in the back and about 70% of the house to stay as it does right now. Mr. Bass explained that the intention is to preserve the rear of the house for a carport or a garage. Mr. Bass stated that it is not shown here, as that is a future plan. Mr. Bass stated that he wants a porch on the side but turned it away to get a master bedroom and a great room on the lower level. Mr. Bass stated that this is a one-over-one window package addition, not a one-over-four, and that the new ridge requested was to lower the ridge.

Ms. Pearce asked if this plan came to DRC.

Ms. Hall answered no.

Ms. Pearce stated that she would approve the front of the house as proposed but the rear addition would be suggested to attend the DRC. Ms. Pearce stated that having the rear elevation read as a full two-story while the front reads as a story-and-a-half, it may require some thinking. Ms. Pearce thanked Mr. Bass for the work he has done with preservation in the city.

Mr. Bass asked whether if the rear was shown a little softer, if that would matter.

Ms. Pearce answered that it would not matter.

Mr. Bass asked about any infill that could go behind his home.

Ms. Powers stated that infill is a site plan issue that would go to the Planning Commission and that the Historic Zoning Commission would only look at the design of the infill homes. Ms. Powers stated that the infill could maybe be a PUD, but Historic Zoning has no authority over approving infill.

Ms. Pearce made the motion that the front porch plan and the partial demolition, and returning the front of the house to the way it was built, and that be approved with staff comments and in compliance with the Franklin *Historic Guidelines* and that the rear addition and side addition be deferred to the next Design Review meeting, which is on July 21st.

Mr. Hathaway seconded this motion. The vote carried unanimously (7-0).

12. Items Approved by the Preservation Planner on Behalf of the Historic Zoning Commission, pursuant to the *Historic District Design Guidelines*

- Fencing at 103, 104, & 105 Cottage Ln.; Vandalia Cottages LLC, Applicant.
- Sign Face at 232 5th Ave. N.; Jason Collins, Applicant.
- Fencing at 418 Boyd Mill Ave.; Mel & Mike Payne, Applicants.
- Awning (Canvas Only) & Decal Signage at 400 Main St., Ste. 210; Amber Andres, Applicant.

13. Discussion of Memorandum Related to Process of Approval for Large-Scale Project in Downtown Franklin.

Chairwoman Besser introduced the next discussion for the memorandum for the Process of Approval for Large-Scale Projects in Downtown Franklin.

Mr. Vernon Gerth presented the following main points:

- This memo is in regards to large projects in Downtown Franklin, such as the ~\$50M Harpeth Square Project on a total of about 5 acres consisting of ~120 hotel rooms and 70,000-90,000 square footage of retail space
- The memo is to help respond to the aspects of what would make this type of development difficult.
- To be able to look critically at how we, the City of Franklin, look at projects
- To have little to no conflicts with the Franklin Municipal Zoning Ordinance
- To help approve the intended outcome
- To help see redevelopment in the future
- May require changes in *Guidelines* and ordinances
- There will be requested meetings

Mr. Pearce added to the discussion that Westhaven had also brought similar meetings to discuss such precious fabric in the city.

Mr. Womack asked about delays and backup and how all commissions would come together and where would the HZC fit in.

Mr. Gerth explained that the HZC addresses the residents and that the commissions get everyone together for a process to provide input together. Mr. Gerth explained that the goal is not to go backwards and to limit the issues. Mr. Gerth noted that he will be presenting this memo to the Planning Commission as well.

Mr. Roberts asked how he saw an all-commission meeting going.

Mr. Gerth answered that together, they would understand the properties and vision and that they would help each other make sure plans work as a group and help staff make good decisions.

Mr. Pearce stated that she appreciates the intention and suggested looking at other communities with these types of projects.

Mr. Gerth added that they would look at these projects with a pattern book-type process.

Ms. Pearce asked about rezoning and how to get over the hurdles before 100 units are drawn, which Planning Commission would most likely approve.

Chairwoman Besser stated that her concern was that the HZC still has input on these types of projects.

Mr. Thompson stated that the process needs improvement and that the process needs to be ready.

Chairwoman Besser asked whether this was a done-deal projection of the memo.

Mr. Gerth answered no, and that it is only to achieve a desired result.

Ms. Nesbitt brought up the fact that this is a progress to a point and that infill is becoming rampant.

Ms. Pearce agreed saying that the historic districts would be delisted by the National Register of Historic Districts if infill keeps going the way it does.

Mr. Gerth concluded that they may need infill / flag lot guidelines introduced.

Ms. Pearce stated that the Tennessee Historic Registry could come and delist Franklin as a historic city.

14. Other Business.

There was no other business to discuss.

15. Adjourn.

Ms. Pearce moved to adjourn the July 14th, 2014, Historic Zoning Commission Meeting. Ms. Nesbitt seconded this motion. The Historic Zoning Commission adjourned at 8:19pm.